

Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #905
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Mon, 20 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 905

Today's Topics:

(#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters
 Military aircraft callsigns...Eugen
 Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski
 OO's and "Policy"
 SuperDF Principle of Operation

Date: 20 Nov 89 03:07:24 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: (#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters

> From: parnass@cbnewsc.ATT.COM (Bob Parnass, AJ9S)
>
> It's getting near the holiday season -- a great time for listening
> to store security guards catch shoplifters. If you have a scanner,
> or extended coverage ham transceiver, you can get in on the action.
> Most of the following frequencies are for Illinois, but may also be
> used in other parts of the country.

Parnass, you've gone off the deep end with this irresponsible posting. Is your hobby of electronic voyeurism so vital to you that it justifies aiding criminals to evade detection and apprehension? I think you need to recheck your priorities.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

ies.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

--
Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 20 Nov 89 10:39:04 GMT
From: gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!uakari.primate.wisc.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: Military aircraft callsigns...Eugen

> Wrong! For example, ALL messages on AUTODIN are encrypted for the express
 > purpose of denying any potential adversary the knowledge that any messages are
 > more important than the others.
 >
 > > Are you telling me that it is OK for the Russians to listen to SAC, but
 > > NOT OK
 > > for Americans to listen to SAC?
 >
 > It's not OK for either.
 >
 > > When I was a kid, we had the Communications Act of 1934, which said I
 > > could
 > > listen to ANYTHING, so long as I didn't use it for commercial gain. I'm
 > > certainly not going to trust YOU to decide what I can listen to!
 >
 > Your interpretation of the Communications Act is erroneous. The ECPA became
 > necessary because electronic Peeping Toms abused the privacy portions of the
 > CommAct.
 >
 > You shouldn't have to trust me. I'm not involved. It's the message sender's
 > right to say "This is none of your business." This right is protected by the
 > constitution and laws of the United States.
 >
 > It's true the public owns the spectrum, but then the public also owns the
 > highways. That doesn't give you any rights with regard to anyone else's car or
 > its contents.

While I'm not disputing the interpretations of the laws as we have them today,
 I do feel that these things do not need to be, and indeed SHOULD NOT BE as
 they are in a free society we think of ourselves as having (but actually do
 not because of the paranoia of politicians). Although it is not the case in
 1934, it *IS* the case that today we have scrambling and cryptographic systems
 so thorough that privacy and secrecy can almost be assured by their use. The
 military knows these things VERY well, and implements it. These systems are
 good enough that there should be NO NEED for an ECPA.

I will extend your analogy about the car on the highway a little to explain
 what I mean. If I leave my car unattended on the highway and locked, I should
 not expect someone to be rummaging around in its contents. If on the other
 hand I empty its contents on the side of the road and leave those unattended,
 I can full well expect someone to rummage through it, take what they want, and
 if they are really cruel, substitute items so that when I return to collect my
 things, I will have been given something I may not want. These two scenarios
 apply to ENCRYPTED and OPEN radio communications where the waves pass by my
 legal place of being. This is my opinion.

He who does not encrypt is foolish (except hams).

Cellular phone users are foolish, too.
The ECPA is a farce.
This is all my opinion.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 20 Nov 89 03:07:00 GMT
From: gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!
f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@apple.com (Jim Grubs)
Subject: Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski

> From: kaufman@Neon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman)
> In article <8060.2561BBFC@stjhmc.fidonet.org>
> Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org (Jim Grubs) writes:
> -> From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)
> - > Newsgroups: rec.ham-radio
> - >
> - > My question is: Why would you be interested in what the call signs are
> - > or represent?
>
> >Amen!!! I'm becoming upset not only with this type of posting but also the
>
> >people who refer to the ECPA as the "American No Right to Listen GESTAPO
> Law".
> >Whatever happened to respect for privacy? When I was a kid, among the
> first
> >things I was taught was "Keep your paws off other people's stuff and your
> nose
> >out of other people's business."
>
> Wait a minute! The Air Force transmissions are deliberately sent
> unscrambled
> because we have an agreement with the Russians that normal traffic will
> be sent
> unscrambled so that each side can tell that there is nothing nefarious
> afoot.

Wrong! For example, ALL messages on AUTODIN are encrypted for the express
purpose of denying any potential adversary the knowledge that any messages are
more important than the others.

> Are you telling me that it is OK for the Russians to listen to SAC, but
> NOT OK
> for Americans to listen to SAC?

It's not OK for either.

> When I was a kid, we had the Communications Act of 1934, which said I
> could
> listen to ANYTHING, so long as I didn't use it for commercial gain. I'm
> certainly not going to trust YOU to decide what I can listen to!

Your interpretation of the Communications Act is erroneous. The ECPA became necessary because electronic Peeping Toms abused the privacy portions of the CommAct.

You shouldn't have to trust me. I'm not involved. It's the message sender's right to say "This is none of your business." This right is protected by the constitution and laws of the United States.

It's true the public owns the spectrum, but then the public also owns the highways. That doesn't give you any rights with regard to anyone else's car or its contents.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

't give you any rights with regard to anyone else's car or its contents.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 19 Nov 89 11:26:48 GMT
From: mips!prls!philabs!ttidca!sorgatz@apple.com (Avatar)
Subject: OO's and "Policy"

In article <2525@wyse.wyse.com> steview@wyse.UUCP (Steve Wilson xttemp dept303) writes:

+ {some stuff deleted, yes..you notice how the ARRL split 6-land? ;-) }
+I don't set these standards, there set in Newington. I just abide by them.

ARRL HQ @ Newington, Conn. needs, and you can quote me on this, an ENEMA!

+What is really needed is someone with a mature outlook. These preliminary
+standards are just front end requirements. Its up to the SM/OOC to make an
+appointment(depending if the SM has delegated this responsibility to the OOC).

+

Yes, yes..I u n d e r s t a n d all that!

+What I look for is someone who isn't going to take the attitude that he's
+a band-cop, or that he is going to single-handedly straighten everything
+out. Now this is a value judgement on my part as to whether an individual
+is qualified. Thats part of my job description as OOC.

+

Thats ok...I trust you! I trust our OOC here too!

+I'm actually looking for someone that will do the job but doesn't enjoy
+it. That sounds like clashing goals, but I'm after someone whos motives
+are to do the job because it needs to be done, not because of some sort
+of power trip.

+

+If you meet these requirements then go talk to your SM/OOC and apply!

+

I did, I'm not eligible until April 1990. Awww...:(Too bad, really, becuz
I've got a little-black-book with the addresses of a lot of the CB-bootlegger
types that have infested the lower 100KHz of 10 meters...and the SM knows it!

73 de Erik KB6LUY

--

-Avatar-> (aka: Erik K. Sorgatz) KB6LUY +-----+
Citicorp(+)TTI *-----> panic trap; type = N+1 *
3100 Ocean Park Blvd. (213) 450-9111, ext. 2973 +-----+
Santa Monica, CA 90405 {csun,philabs,randvax,trwrbr}!ttidca!ttidcb!sorgatz **

Date: 20 Nov 89 10:39:10 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!uakari.prima.te.wisc.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: SuperDF Principle of Operation

> NOTE: I've gotten a lot of email about the SuperDF. I have had poor luck
> in responding (our mailer is not too smart). A couple of comments:

And the other way around does not work well for some of us, either.
Oh well.

> (1) SuperDF has been around for a number of years.

Never heard of it until recently here on the net.

> (2) It is sold as a kit or assembled.

Am very interested in who sells it. Pointers to ads in latest issues of QST, HR, CQ, 73, would be good, if they advertise there. Otherwise a company name, address, and phone number would sure help.

> (3) I have no interest in it other than that I have one, and that I know
> Russ Andrews, the creator of it.

Where does one find Russ Andrews, and are there any technical articles on how it works?

> (4) In theory, a doppler system can be as sensitive and accurate as
> the SuperDF. In practice, I haven't seen one that is either.

Haven't tried any yet, but I sure want to.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #905
